

[a]bsent a showing of corrupt failure of the government to discharge its duty, the Court, in making its public interest finding, should . . . carefully consider the explanations of the government in the competitive impact statement and its responses to comments in order to determine whether those explanations are reasonable under the circumstances.

United States v. Mid-America Dairymen, Inc., 1997-1 Trade Cas. ¶ 61,508, at 71.980 (W.D. Mo. 1997).

Accordingly, with respect to the adequacy of the relief secured by the decree, a court may not "engage in an unrestricted evaluation of what relief would best serve the public." *United States v. BNS, Inc.*, 858 F.2d 456, 462 (9th Cir. 1988), citing *United States v. Bechtel Corp.*, 648 F.2d 660, 666 (9th Cir. 1981); see also *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1460-62. Precedent requires that

the balancing of competing social and political interests affected by a proposed antitrust consent decree must be left, in the first instance, to the discretion of the Attorney General. The court's role in protecting the public interest is one of insuring that the government has not breached its duty to the public in consenting to the decree. The court is required to determine not whether a particular decree is the one that will best serve society, but whether the settlement is "within the reaches of the public interest." More elaborate requirements might undermine the effectiveness of antitrust enforcement by consent decree.²

The proposed Final Judgment, therefore, should not be reviewed under a standard of whether it is certain to eliminate every anticompetitive effect of a particular practice or whether it mandates certainty of free competition in the future. Court approval of a final judgment requires a standard more flexible and less strict than the standard required for a finding of liability. "[A] proposed decree must be approved even if it falls short of the remedy the court would impose on its own, as long as it falls within the range of acceptability or is within the reaches of public interest."³

This is strong and effective relief that should fully address the likely

competitive harm posed by the proposed merger.

VIII. Determinative Documents

There are no determinative materials or documents within the meaning of the APPA that were considered by the United States in formulating the proposed Final Judgment.

Dated: March 23, 1999.

Respectfully submitted,

Allee A. Ramadhan, John C. Filippini, Joseph M. Miller,

Attorneys, Merger Task Force, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 1401 H Street, N.W., Suite 4000, Washington, D.C. 20530, (202) 307-0001.

[FR Doc. 99-7975 Filed 3-31-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Registration

By Notice dated October 1, 1998, and published in the **Federal Register** on October 9, 1998 (63 FR 54490), Ansys Diagnostics, Inc., 25200 Commercentre Drive, Lake Forest, California 92630, made application by renewal to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed below:

Drug	Schedule
Phencyclidine (7471)	II
1-Piperidinocyclohexane-carbonitrile (PCC) (8603)	II
Benzoyllecgonine (9180)	II

The firm plans to manufacture the listed controlled substances to produce standards and controls for in-vitro diagnostic drug testing systems.

DEA has considered the factors in Title 21, United States Code, section 823(a) and determined that the registration of Ansys Diagnostics, Inc. to manufacture the listed controlled substances is consistent with the public interest at this time. DEA has investigated Ansys Diagnostics, Inc. on a regular basis to ensure that the company's continued registration is consistent with the public interest. These investigations have included inspection and testing of the company's physical security systems, audits of the company's records, verification of the company's compliance with state and local laws, and a review of the company's background and history. Therefore, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823 and 28 CFR 0.100 and 0.104, the Deputy

Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, hereby orders that the application submitted by the above firm for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed above is granted.

Dated: March 17, 1999.

John H. King,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 99-7936 Filed 3-31-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 97-19]

Cadiz Thrift-T Drug, Inc., Termination of Registration

On June 3, 1997, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) issued an Order to Show Cause to Cadiz Thrift-T Drug, Inc. (Respondent) of Cadiz, Kentucky, notifying it of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke its DEA Certificate of Registration BC5009421 pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(1), (2) and (4), and deny any applications for renewal of such registration as a retail pharmacy pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f), for reason that the pharmacy "falsified an application for registration, an owner-operator of the pharmacy was convicted of a felony related to controlled substances, and your continued registration is inconsistent with the public interest. . . ."

By letter dated June 30, 1997, Respondent filed a request for a hearing, and following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Nashville, Tennessee on October 29 and 30, 1997, before Administration Law Judge Gail A. Randall. At the hearing, both parties called witnesses to testify and introduced documentary evidence. After the hearing both parties filed proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law and argument. On July 31, 1998, Judge Randall issued her Opinion and Recommended Ruling, recommending that Respondent's DEA registration be revoked, but that the revocation be stayed for three years.

On August 20, 1998 both parties filed exceptions to the Opinion and Recommended Ruling of the Administrative Law Judge. In addition, on August 20, 1998, Respondent filed a Motion to Dismiss arguing that Respondent has ceased doing business

Cong. 2d Sess. 8-9 (1974), reprinted in U.S.C.A.N. 6535, 6538.

² *Bechtel*, 648 F.2d at 666 (citations omitted)(emphasis added); see *BNS*, 858 F.2d at 463; *United States v. National Broadcasting Co.*, 449 F. Supp. 1127, 1143 (C.D. Cal. 1978); *Gillette*, 406 F. Supp. at 716. See also *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1461 (whether "the remedies [obtained in the decree are] so inconsonant with the allegations charged as to fall outside of the 'reaches of the public interest'")(citations omitted).

³ *United States v. American Tel. and Tel Co.*, 552 F. Supp. 131, 151 (D.D.C. 1982), *aff'd sub nom. Maryland v. United States*, 460 U.S. 1001 (1983), quoting *Gillette Co.*, 406 F. Supp. at 716 (citations omitted); *United States v. Alcan Aluminum Ltd.*, 605 F. Supp. 619, 622 (W.D. Ky. 1985).